MORGAN, LEWIS &
BOCKIUS LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
LOS ANGELES

1-LA/972023.1

DEFENDANT EX PARTE APP. TO FILE MOTION TO DISMISS – C 07-06073 MHP

Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 7-10 and this Court's Standing Order, Defendant Charming Shoppes of Delaware, Inc. ("Defendant") respectfully submits this *ex parte* application to file a motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 12(b)(2) for hearing on February 11, 2008. This request is based on this application, the pleadings and papers filed in this action, and any argument that the Court may deem necessary.

Defendant originally filed a motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction for hearing on January 16, 2008 before assigned United States Magistrate Judge Bernard Zimmerman. *See* Docket Entry Nos. 9-10 (December 7, 2007). This case was reassigned to this Court on December 11, 2007. *See* Docket Entry No. 17 (December 11, 2007). On December 12, 2007, this Court vacated all pending hearing dates and scheduled this case for a Case Management Conference on March 24, 2008. *See* Docket Entry No. 18 (December 12, 2007). This Court's Standing Order requires that "[m]otions to dismiss shall not be filed before the initial Case Management Conference except by leave of court." *See* Standing Order, Notice No. 4.

Defendant now seeks leave to file a motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction for hearing before this Court. The Court's calendar clerk advised counsel for Defendant that Defendant could concurrently file the motion to dismiss with this *ex* parte application. Thus, Defendant is concurrently filing with this *ex parte* application a motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction for hearing on February 11, 2008. Defendant argues in its motion that it has minimal contact with California. It does not have "substantial" or "continuous and systematic" contacts with California for general personal jurisdiction. Defendant also has not "purposely availed" itself of the privileges of doing business in California to establish specific personal jurisdiction. Thus, the exercise of personal jurisdiction over Defendant, which never employed Plaintiff (or anyone else in California), would violate federal due process requirements, and this Court must dismiss this action. Moreover, Plaintiff has recently filed a state court class action alleging the same causes of action against the correct defendant, Lane Bryant, Inc., which employed Plaintiff and does have the requisite "minimum contacts" for personal jurisdiction. *See* Defendant's Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Support of Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Personal Jurisdiction (filed concurrently); *see* also Docket Entry No. 10.

28
MORGAN, LEWIS &
BOCKIUS LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
LOS ANGELES

28
MORGAN, LEWIS &
BOCKIUS LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
LOS ANGELES

1-LA/972023.1